International Journal of Human Resource Management and Research (IJHRMR)
ISSN(P): 2249-6874; ISSN(E): 2249-7986
Vol. 6, Issue 6, Dec 2016, 1-14

TRANS STELLAR
•Journal Publications •Research Consultancy

RELATIONSHIP OF JOB BURNOUT WITH DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES – A CASE STUDY OF PUBLIC & PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN INDIA

SAYEEDUZZAFAR QAZI[1] & TEJBIR KAUR[2]

[1]*Professor, HRM Department, CBA, University of Business and Technology, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia*

[2]*Assistant Professor, School of Commerce & Management, Sri Guru Granth Sahib World University, Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab. India*

ABSTRACT

The present research paper investigates the relationship of demographic variables like age, experience, gender and designation with Total Job burnout as well as 3 dimensions of Job Burnout i.e 'Emotional Exhaustion', 'Depersonalization' and 'Diminished Personal Accomplishment as given by Maslach and Jackson (1981) Burnout Inventory . The data was collected and analysed during the time period of 2015 from teaching fraternity working in Public & Private Universities of India. Faculty members from Management, Engineering and Basic Sciences departments with designation Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor were selected as a sample keeping in mind the availability of the data, cost to be incurred and the distance to be travelled for data collection. Only faculty members with more than one year of experience were taken in to consideration. The data were analysed by using mean, standard deviation, t-test & critical ratio method, One way ANOVA. A significant difference was found in Job Burnout levels of faculty teaching in public & private universities of Punjab on the basis of Designation, Experience, Qualification whereas on the basis of Gender there was no significant difference in total Job Burnout & its three dimensions i.e Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization & Diminished Personal Accomplishment.

KEYWORDS: Job Burnout, Emotional Exhaustion, Depersonalization & Diminished Personal Accomplishment

Received: Sep 16, 2016; **Accepted:** Oct 15, 2016; **Published:** Oct 20, 2016; **Paper Id.:** IJHRMRDEC20161

Case Study

INTRODUCTION TO CONC EPT OF JOB BURNOUT

Job burnout has come into consideration as a concept in 1970s onwards and something very noteworthy came into limelight which was related to people and their occupation. This is in continuation till date though it's been some 35 years from foundation of this concept to emotional literature and related civilized exchange of ideas. Since then, burnout is known as a concept that is been practised commonly among large number of people. Due to its importance & impact on masses, Burnout has persuaded many experimenters to go deep to the roots, learn it more and try to recognize reasons of its occurrence in a better way. It has also stimulated practitioners to outline ways to deal with it, avert it, or fight with it. Thus, since beginning, burnout as a concept has allured both practitioners & experimenters as a common society problem and so must be given utmost attention in all sectors where human jobs are concerned. According to Sinha V. (2010) Burnout can be defined as the end result of stress experienced, but not properly coped with resulting in symptoms of exhaustion, irritation, ineffectiveness, discounting of self, others and problems of health (Hypertension, Ulcers and Heart Problems).

Maslach et al. (2001) provided a comprehensive analysis about the three stages of burnout: "high levels of exhaustion cause depersonalization; if depersonalization continues, the feelings of accomplishment would then

be reduced." Although there are various definitions about job burnout, they provide similar explanation that job burnout can be generalized as the negative emotional responses to the job.

Emotional Exhaustion

It is the main factor for burnout and the most distinct level of burnout symptoms. This dimension of burnout signifies the basic response to stress. In fact, emotional exhaustion is a requisite dimension for definition of burnout and without this dimension burnout concept may be incomplete (Maslach and Jackson 1981).

Depersonalization (Cynicism)

In revision of some studies relating to burnout, depersonalization usually emerges after emotional exhaustion and in fact it is a direct response to occupational stress. In other words, depersonalization denotes non- emotional irrelevant and hostile responses to referent people (service receivers) and colleagues etc. with burnout syndrome of negative emotions and attitudes followed by others' reprimand (Maslach and Jackson, 1981).

Individual Inefficacy (Personal failure)

The relationship among individual efficacy is relatively more complicated with two other burnout dimensions. In some studies, it seems that dimension of individual inefficacy is the outcome for two other dimensions of burnout but in some other cases, this assumption has not been approved while it emphasizes that such elements grow in parallel and along with each other instead of placement as a chain side by side of others. In other words, individual efficacy stands for sense of adequacy and successful advance in working with other individuals (Maslach, 1981).

Review of Studies Related With Job Burnout and Demographic Characteristics

Like other phenomena linked to occupation, job burnout has been studied in comparison with individual and demographic features. In terms of gender, the studies of Cordes & Dougherty (1993), Gunes, Bayraktar, & Kutanis, (2009), Kabuoh & Anazodo (2012), Lackritz (2004) found that women are experiencing more often the job burnout syndrome than men.

Cakınberk (2011) in his research that he had done for bank officials he found that among men and women is a statistically significant difference in the variable emotional exhaustion, with men experiencing greater amounts of emotional exhaustion than women. However, it was found no difference in the mean scores of depersonalization and personal accomplishment. It was also found that bank employees that held bachelors and master's degree experienced depersonalization more often compared to non-university degree holders. However, for the variable "personal accomplishment" it was found that there is a statistically significant difference between graduates and non-graduates, with non-graduates experiencing the feeling of personal accomplishment more often.

In contrast, Gorji &Vaziri (2011) study held among bank employees, finds that the factor age affects the amount of burnout that it's being experienced by someone. More specifically, it was observed an increase in the amount of the experienced burnout when there was an increase of age in the sample. Similar results were found in the studies of Tomic, Evers, & Brouwers, (2004), Lackritz (2004) and Ahola et al. (2005), where they found a statistically significant relationship between burnout and the factor age.

Finally, there have been studies in which it was found that the factor sex/gender had absolutely no effect in the experienced amount of job burnout (Lackritz, 2004; Maslach et al., 2001). In the study of a credit institution, it was found

that burnout was higher in employees with more experience and more years of working as bank employees than those with fewer years of work experience (Gorji & Vaziri, 2011).

In contrast, in the research of Kabuoh & Anazodo (2012), also in a financial institution, it was observed that people with 1-15 years of overall experience were experiencing personal accomplishment more rarely. Wofford (2003) found that demographic factors are related to the magnitude of job satisfaction of employees in construction organizations, such as age, gender, tenure and job position.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Objective of the Study

To understand the relationship between different demographic variables (Gender, experience, Educational Qualification and designation) with Job satisfaction & Job burnout.

Hypothesis of the Study

$H_{05A=}$ "There is no significant difference b/w Job Burnout level in Public & Private Universities of Punjab on the basis of Gender."

$H_{05B=}$"There is no significant difference b/w Job Burnout level of faculty in Public & Private Universities of Punjab on the basis of Designation."

$H_{05C=}$"There is no significant difference b/w Job Burnout levels of faculty in Public & Private Universities of Punjab on the basis of Qualification."

$H_{05D=}$"There is no significant difference in Job Burnout levels of faculty teaching in Public & Private Universities on the basis of Experience."

Sampling & Distribution of Sample

Thorndike (1979) proposed a rule or informal guide that "there should be ten respondent for each variable plus fifty respondents". And as per the guideline or the rule, in this particular research 12*10+50 = 170 respondents can be ideal sample.

Also, Malhotra (2009) argues that for studying behaviour/perception/attitude, minimum sample of 300 is required. Here sample size taken for this study is well above that mark. The questionnaire was distributed among 500 faculty members but only 410 filled responses were returned with a response rate of 82%. After scrutiny of the filled questionnaire, 42 responses were rejected because of various reasons like incomplete information, wrong entries etc. The remaining 368 i.e 89.75 % cases were used as sample in this study.

Table 1: Designation Wise Sample Break-up

S. No	Designation	Frequency	Percentage
1	Professor	11	3.0
2	Associate Professor	27	7.3
3	Assistant Professor	330	89.7

Table 1 shows that the faculty members contacted for collection of data were of three different designations. There were 11 Faculty members who were working as Professors, 27 faculty members who were working as Associate Professors &

Table 2: Qualification Wise Sample Distribution

S. No	Qualification	Frequency	Percentage
1	**PhD's**	126	34.2
2	**Non-PhD's**	242	65.7

Table 2 shows the sample distribution on the basis of qualification of faculty members. The qualification of both type of university faculty was further divided into 2 categories i.e the faculty who obtained Ph.D degree & the faculty who is Non-Ph.D & not yet obtained the doctorate degree. It was observed by researcher that there were 126 faculty members who were with Ph.D degree & 242 faculty members were Non- Ph.D who participated in survey.

Table 3: Experience Wise Sample Distribution

S. No	Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1	Novice Faculty	206	56.0
2	Mod. Experienced Faculty	91	24.7
3	Experienced Faculty	19	5.2
4	Highly Experienced Faculty	52	14.1

Table 3 shows the sample distribution on the basis of Experience of faculty. The experience of university faculty was further divided into 4 categories i.e Novice faculty members=1 to 5 years of experience, moderately experienced=6-10 years, experienced faculty=11-15 years whereas faculty having experience 15 years & above was given nomenclature of highly experienced Faculty. It was observed that 206 faculty members fall in Novice faculty member category, 91 faculty members fall in Mod. Experienced Faculty category, 19 faculty members fall in experienced faculty member category & 52 faculty members fall in Highly Experienced faculty member category who participated in the survey conducted by researcher from Public/State & Private Universities of Punjab State.

Table 4: Gender wise Sample Distribution

S. No	Gender	Frequency	Percentage
1	Male	174	47.3
2	Female	194	52.7
3	Total	368	100.0

Table 4 shows the sample distribution on the basis of Gender of faculty. It was observed that there were 174 male faculty members who participated in the survey & 194 female faculty members participated in the survey when contacted for collection of data from State & Private Universities of Punjab State.

Table 5: University Wise Sample Break-up

S. No	University Type	Frequency	Percentage
1	Public/ State	139	37.8
2	Private	229	62.2
3	Total	368	100.0

Table 5 shows that the faculty members who were contacted for collection of data belong to two categories of Universities. There were 139 Faculty members who were working in Public/ State Universities of Punjab whereas 229 Faculty members were working in Private Universities of Punjab

RESULTS & DISCUSSION OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

(Gender, Age, Educational Qualification and Designation) & their Relationship with Job Burnout

Job Burnout Level on the Basis of Gender of Faculty

This section deals with Mean Values and standard deviation for JB level of faculty on Gender basis. Table 6 depicts mean values & S.D Values for all the three dimensions of Job Burnout, According to which there is not any significantly predicted difference in both type of gender.

Table 6: T Statistics for Total JB, E.E. DEP & Efficacy of Faculty of Public & Private University

Dimensions	T-test for Equality of Means			
	CR	df	Sig. (2-Tailed)	
Emotional Exhaustion		-.373	366	.709
		-.373	359.704	.709
Depersonalization		1.008	366	.314
		1.004	354.356	.316
Efficacy		.143	366	.886
		.142	338.531	.887
Burnout Total		-.448	366	.654
		-.450	365.716	.653

Sig value-.05

As per the T - significance value shown in Table 6, The Null hypothesis is accepted due to all significant values of T > .05. In contrast to this result, some studies show that burnout occurs more often in women than in men. The inconsistency of burnout‘s relation to gender is most likely attributable to role expectations and job level. Nurses are more likely to be women, and police officers are more likely to be men, and supervisors or managers are more likely to be men. Within such groups, gender would have different mediating roles and the impact of gender on burnout would then vary by the group studied. Unmarried people, especially men, seem to be more susceptible to burnout (Maslach & Jackson, 1996; McDermett, 1984).

There have been studies in which it was found that the factor sex/gender had absolutely no effect in the experienced amount of job burnout (Lackritz, 2004; Maslach et al., 2001). The result supports the findings of Kaur T & Zafar (2014) who conducted a study on private universities in Punjab & found no significant difference in burnout levels among faculty on the basis of their Gender.

Table 7: Comparative Analysis of Job Burnout of Private & Public Universities on the basis of Gender

Gender	Measure	E.E (Public Uni)	E.E (Private Uni)	DEP (Public Uni)	DEP (Private Uni)	Efficacy (Public Uni)	Efficacy (Private Uni)	Burnout Total (Public Uni)	Burnout Total (Private Uni)
Male	Mean	19.83	*21.02*	*14.52*	10.35	*34.60*	29.61	*62.12*	61.01
	N	52	122	52	122	52	122	52	122
	Std. Deviation	6.096	7.952	7.855	4.295	13.868	5.334	6.236	10.738
Female	Mean	20.01	*21.72*	*11.89*	10.28	*32.31*	29.90	61.52	*62.05*
	N	87	107	87	107	87	107	87	107
	Std. Deviation	7.260	7.236	6.977	3.749	9.751	4.926	9.701	11.017
Total	Mean	19.94	*21.35*	*12.87*	10.32	*33.17*	29.75	*61.74*	61.49

Table 7: Contd.,									
	N	139	229	139	229	139	229	139	229
	Std. Deviation	6.826	7.617	7.401	4.040	11.470	5.138	8.550	10.858

Sig value-.05

Table 7 provides very important finding for variable Job Burnout under study & compares JB level of both Private & Public/ State Universities on Gender basis. Starting from the overall Job Burnout score, The Public university faculty is facing slightly more Burnout as compared to Faculty of Private Universities of Punjab. This is a bit strange result

The reasons can be discussed in the light of study conducted by G. Lokanadha Reddy and R. Poornima (2012) in 9 state universities of south India. "The results revealed that majority (74%) of the university teachers are experiencing moderate and high levels of occupational stress and 86 percent of teachers have professional burnout. Also, the analysis showed strong support for the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between the occupational stress and professional burnout of university teachers. Stepwise multiple regression analysis shows that the occupational stress has accounted 7.6 percent of variance to professional burnout."

Furthermore our results reveal that the Private University teachers are suffering from more ***Emotional exhaustion (21.35>19.94)*** but Public University faculty is having higher mean score in Depersonalization ***(12.87>10.32)*** & diminished personal ***(33.17>29.75)*** accomplishment as compared to Private University Teachers. The teachers working in Public Universities when get settled in Government Job, they start least bothering about their clients i.e students. This might be due to no fear of losing job whereas on the other hand Private university teacher's are accountable for uploading attendance online every day, transparency in assignment marks to students and are answerable for even bad results in the subjects allotted to them. If we compare Job Burnout dimensions on the gender basis from the table, there is no significant difference between scores of JB dimensions of male & female teacher's teaching in Public & Private Universities. Both Male & Female of Private Universities are suffering from moderately higher Emotional exhaustion whereas Male & Female teachers of public universities are suffering moderately higher Depersonalization & diminished Personal accomplishment score.

These findings are in support of Reddy, G. L., & Poornima, R. (2012) which recommends that "the colleagues and the head of the department should be motivated to support the teachers adequately in their teaching and research activities in order to reduce burnout.

Job Burnout Level on the Basis of Designation of Faculty

This section deals with statistical testing for JB level of faculty for three designations understudy namely; Assistant Professor, Associate Professor & Professor's using One Way ANOVA test.

Table 8: Mean & S.D Values for Total JB Level of Faculty on Designation Basis

Designation	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Assistant Professor	330	62.03	9.704	.534	60.98	63.08
Associate Professor	27	59.04	13.668	2.630	53.63	64.44
Professor	11	54.55	5.939	1.791	50.56	58.54
Total	**368**	**61.59**	**10.037**	**.523**	**60.56**	**62.62**

Sig value-.05

Table 8 is showing difference of mean values of faculty members suffering from burnout. The ANOVA Table 9 depicts that the JB level of faculty differs only in two dimensions i.e E.E & Depersonalization with significance values (.000 & .002) respectively & also in Total Burnout level.

Table 9: ANOVA & F statistics for J.B of Faculty on the basis of Designation

Categories		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Emotional Exhaustion	Between Groups	845.017	2	422.508	8.124	.000
	Within Groups	18983.785	365	52.010		
	Total	19828.802	367			
Depersonalization	Between Groups	414.363	2	207.182	6.616	.002
	Within Groups	11430.245	365	31.316		
	Total	11844.609	367			
Efficacy/ Self Accomplishment	Between Groups	285.027	2	142.513	2.089	.125
	Within Groups	24900.441	365	68.220		
	Total	25185.467	367			
Burnout Total	Between Groups	785.830	2	392.915	3.963	.020
	Within Groups	36189.387	365	99.149		
	Total	36975.217	367			

Sig value-.05

The researcher interpret from post hoc table 10 that the significant difference shown in previous table 9 lies with designations Assistant Professor with that of Professor & no significant difference in burnout dimensions is shown in case of Associate Professor.

Table 10: Post Hoc Test & Tukey's Test Results for J.B of Faculty on the Basis of Designation

Dependent Variable	(I) Designation	(J) Designation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig
Emotional Exhaustion	*Asst Professor*	Associate Professor	2.468	1.444	.203
		Professor	*8.245**	*2.210*	*.001*
	Associate Professor	Asst Professor	-2.468	1.444	.203
		Professor	5.778	2.580	.066
	Professor	Asst Professor	*-8.245**	*2.210*	*.001*
		Associate Professor	-5.778	2.580	.066
Depersonalization	Asst Professor	Associate Professor	1.456	1.120	.396
		Professor	*5.930**	*1.715*	.002
	Associate Professor	Asst Professor	-1.456	1.120	.396
		Professor	4.475	2.002	.067
	Professor	Asst Professor	-5.930*	1.715	.002
		Associate Professor	-4.475	2.002	.067
Efficacy	Asst Professor	Associate Professor	.800	1.653	.879
		Professor	-4.961	2.532	.124
	Associate Professor	Asst Professor	-.800	1.653	.879
		Professor	-5.761	2.954	.126

	Professor	Asst Professor	4.961	2.532	.124
		Associate Professor	5.761	2.954	.126
Burnout Total	Asst Professor	Associate Professor	2.993	1.993	.291
		Professor	7.485*	3.052	.039
	Associate Professor	Asst Professor	-2.993	1.993	.291
		Professor	4.492	3.562	.418
	Professor	Asst Professor	-7.485*	3.052	.039
		Associate Professor	-4.492	3.562	.418
*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.					

"Depersonalization refers to a negative, callous and detached attitude towards the people one works with", i.e. students in this case. Here, Researcher can conclude that this negative attitude decreases with increasing designation. This scenario is alarming because assistant professor is the entry level designation in universities now a days and they have more teaching load as compared to Associate Professor or Professor's which result into their more interaction with the students . When there will be a feeling of detachment with students, the negative impact of such attitude can result into non serious attitude of students, increased conflicts, more political behaviour, Absenteeism in classes and reduced number in admissions in the particular university/ Institution. Reduced personal accomplishment refers to "someone's negative self-evaluation in relation to their job performance" (Schaufeli et al., 1993).

There is a very strange result interpreted in the case of Efficacy / diminished Self accomplishment component on the basis of designation of teaching fraternity. The Professor is suffering from highest negative self evaluation score as compared to associate or assistant professors. This feeling of evaluating oneself negatively in teaching Career is decreasing as the designation is going downwards. The result supports the findings of Kaur T & Zafar (2013) who conducted a study on selected private universities in Punjab & found a significant difference in burnout levels among faculty on the basis of their designation.

Job Burnout Level on the Basis of Qualification of Faculty

This section deals with statistical testing for JB level of faculty for two level of Qualification's understudy namely; faculty holding Ph.D degree, Non- Ph.D faculty using Mean, S.D values & CR / T statistics Value's.

Table 11: Mean & S.D Values for J.B on Basis of Qualification

	Qualification	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Emotional Exhaustion	PhD	126	19.35	6.765
	Non PhD	242	*21.58*	7.538
Depersonalization	PhD	126	9.30	4.198
	Non PhD	242	*12.31*	6.074
Efficacy	PhD	126	30.77	5.994
	Non PhD	242	31.18	9.264
Burnout Total	PhD	126	58.97	8.717
	Non PhD	242	*62.95*	10.419

Table 11 is showing difference of mean values of PhD & Non-PhD faculty members suffering from burnout & mean values for Non-PhD faculty is slightly more as compared to faculty holding PhD degree.

Table 12: T Statistics for J.B on the Basis of Qualification

Dimension	E.E	DEP	Efficacy	Total J.B
T	-2.791	-4.981	-0.448	-3.672
SIG	0.006	.000	0.655	.000

According to the results obtained in T table 12, the significance values of E.E (0.006), DEP (.000) & Total J.B (.000) in case of PhD vs Non PhD's, the null hypothesis is rejected and it is interpreted that there exist a significant difference in various dimensions as well as Total Job Burnout on the basis of Qualification of Faculty members teaching in Public & Private Universities of Punjab. As given by (Maslach, 1976; Maslach and Jackson, 1981) ,"Emotional exhaustion refers to feelings of being emotionally overextended and having depleted one's emotional resources." After achieving such a highest degree in their subject, Faculty feel a sense of emotional satisfaction due to increased reputation in career & job.

Similarly there is huge difference between feelings of depersonalization i.e feeling of negative attitude towards student's b/w PhD vs Non PhD faculty. Faculty holding PhD degree were found more sincere towards their clients i.e students whereas more callous attitude was measured among faculty not holding PhD degree. This may be due to the reason for being new to the teaching profession or less proficiency or mastery over one's subject.

The result supports the findings of Kaur T & Zafar (2013) who conducted a study on selected private universities in Punjab & found a significant difference in burnout levels among faculty on the basis of their qualification.

Job Burnout Level on The Basis of Experience of Faculty

This section deals with statistical testing for JB level of faculty for four categories of Experience understudy namely; Novice Faculty, Experienced Faculty , Moderately Experienced faculty & Highly Experienced Faculty using Mean, S.D values & One way ANOVA.

Table 13: Mean & S.D Values for Total JB Level of Faculty on Experience Basis

Category		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Emotional Exhaustion	Novice Faculty	206	*21.33*	7.383	.514	20.32	22.34
	Moderately Exp. Faculty	91	*21.32*	6.798	.713	19.90	22.73
	Exp. faculty	19	*21.84*	6.882	1.579	18.53	25.16
	Highly Experienced faculty	52	17.54	7.650	1.061	15.41	19.67
	Total	368	20.82	7.350	.383	20.06	21.57
Depersonalization	Novice Faculty	206	*12.36*	6.150	.428	11.51	13.20
	Moderately Exp. Faculty	91	10.57	4.771	.500	9.58	11.56
	Exp. faculty members	19	8.37	2.833	.650	7.00	9.73
	Highly Experienced faculty members	52	9.33	4.958	.687	7.95	10.71

	Total	**368**	**11.28**	**5.681**	**.296**	**10.70**	**11.86**
Efficacy	Novice Faculty Member	206	31.03	10.062	.701	29.65	32.42
	Moderately Exp. Faculty Member	91	30.68	5.882	.617	29.46	31.91
	Exp. faculty members	19	***31.32***	4.295	.985	29.25	33.39
	Highly Experienced faculty members	52	***31.58***	4.331	.601	30.37	32.78
	Total	368	31.04	8.284	.432	30.19	31.89
Burnout Total	Novice Faculty Member	206	***62.11***	10.552	.735	60.66	63.56
	Moderately Exp. Faculty Member	91	***62.21***	8.382	.879	60.46	63.95
	Exp. faculty members	19	61.53	7.582	1.739	57.87	65.18
	Highly Experienced faculty	52	58.44	11.014	1.527	55.38	61.51
	Total	**368**	**61.59**	**10.037**	**.523**	**60.56**	**62.62**

Sig value-.05

Table 14: ANOVA & F statistics for J.B of Faculty on the Basis of Experience

		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Emotional Exhaustion	Between Groups	656.041	3	218.680	4.152	.007
	Within Groups	19172.761	364	52.672		
	Total	19828.802	367			
Depersonalization	Between Groups	645.042	3	215.014	6.988	.000
	Within Groups	11199.567	364	30.768		
	Total	11844.609	367			
Efficacy	Between Groups	28.149	3	9.383	.136	.939
	Within Groups	25157.318	364	69.114		
	Total	25185.467	367			
Burnout Total	Between Groups	606.189	3	202.063	2.022	.110
	Within Groups	36369.029	364	99.915		
	Total	**36975.217**	**367**			

Sig value-.05

The faculty members are divided into four categories on the basis of experience. The categories are: Novice faculty: 1-5, Moderately Exp: 6-10 yrs, Experienced Faculty: 11-15 & Highly Experienced faculty: 15 and above. Table 13 shows mean values and difference of mean values among four categories of experience which is highest in case of faculty members teaching from last 11-15 years for emotional efficacy **(21.84)** & Efficacy or Diminished Accomplishment **(31.32)** .ANOVA Table 14 depicts that the difference among four categories exist only for two dimensions of Burnout i.e ***E.E & DEP***. Thus the null hypothesis is rejected and alternate hypothesis is accepted which shows that there exist a significant

difference in the level of Job Burnout on the basis of experience of faculty members.

Table 15: Post Hoc & Tuckey Test Results for J.B of Faculty on the Basis of Experience

Dimension	(I)Category 1	(J)Category 2	(I-J)M.D	Std. Error
E.E	Novice F	Highly EXP	3.792*	1.126
	Mod EXP. F.	Highly EXP	3.780*	1.262
DEP	Novice F	Mod EXP. F.	1.788	0.698
	EXP. F	Novice F	-3.991*	1.33
	Highly EXP	Novice F	-3.032*	0.861

Post –HOC test Table 15 shows that the novice faculty members are suffering from high level of Job Burnout and they are highly emotionally exhausted than the experienced faculty members. This result is alarming because there is a need of young faculty in the educational institutions due to increased competition & rising need of innovation & creativity in the higher education sector. But the youth is suffering from high burnout.

The result supports the findings of Kaur T & Zafar (2013) who conducted a study on selected private universities in Punjab & found a significant difference in burnout levels among faculty on the basis of their experience.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

- Job Burnout does not differ in all the three dimensions in Public & Private universities of Punjab on the basis of gender. So male & female faculty in both Public & Private universities suffer from similar level of Burnout.
- Assistant Professors i.e. entry level faculty members are suffering maximum level of total Job Burnout as compared to Associate Professors & Professors.
- Assistant Professors have more detached attitude i.e. are measured high on depersonalization dimension with their students as compared to Associate Professor or Professor.
- Professors are suffering from highest negative self evaluation/ efficacy score as compared to Associate or Assistant professors.
- Young teachers associated with Public University with less experience, agreed to be a sufferer of groupthink.
- The faculty holding a PhD degree seems to perceive less emotional exhaustion as compared to Non PhD Faculty in Universities of Punjab.
- Faculty holding PhD degree were found more sincere towards their clients i.e. students whereas more callous attitude was measured among faculty not holding PhD degree.
- novice faculty members having up to 5 years of experience are suffering from high level of Job Burnout and they are highly emotionally exhausted than the experienced faculty members
- Depersonalization dimension is measured high for novice faculty members with up to 5 years of experience as compared to teachers who have spent 6 years or more in the university teaching environment.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

One of the reasons for no significant difference of job burnout on the basis of gender can be a huge increase in number of dual career couples in the teaching profession. Earlier there were more female in the school teaching and more

male in higher education teaching, but with the passage of time, many female joined into the university & college teaching after pursuing doctoral degrees. In the University system, there is not much difference in the kind of administrative tasks given to male & female teachers. Also, during the survey, researcher met with many female faculties who were co-ordinator for the training & placement cell, admission process, examination as well extra co- curricular activities. So both male & female teachers are working under similar kind of pressure. In opposite to this scenario, there exists strong difference between JB score on basis of designation of teachers. Reasons can include lack of self motivation, fewer amounts of teaching hours spent in classes, reduced student interaction, more involvement in administrative tasks rather than research and physical & harmonically changes happening in oneself due to aging. The researcher during the survey while interacting with the entry level assistant professor's found some interesting facts. The Assistant Professor level faculty agreed that they were attracted to university teaching profession due to their keen interest in academics and wanted to pursue their career in research & teaching and go for further doctoral studies after gaining some experience but after entering into the system, they are overfilled with administrative tasks such as admission targets, training & placement targets, conducting cultural activities, pleasing their HOD's by doing extra work even during holidays. They are suffering from more pressure than any corporate job. Interestingly such scenario was prevalent in both Public & Private universities.

Furthermore, there exists a significant difference in various dimensions of JB as well as total Job Burnout on the basis of qualification of faculty members teaching in public & private universities of Punjab. There is also a huge difference between salary & monetary benefits given to faculty holding a PhD degree as compared to faculty with no PhD degree. This factor makes more qualified teachers emotionally stronger than their less qualified counterparts. On the other hand, non PhD faculty lives & works with a feeling of inferiority and all the time they undergo a pressure to achieve PhD degree so that they can also enjoy good reputation and more monitory increments .While the researcher compares Job Burnout on the basis of experience of teacher's it was found that faculty members up to 5 years of experience are suffering from high level of Job Burnout and they are highly emotionally exhausted than the experienced faculty members. Also, there depersonalization level is very high as compared to teachers who have spent 6 years or more in the university teaching. The reasons can be their involvement in non teaching tasks rather than teaching & research.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The apex body responsible for higher education in any country shall make it mandatory to conduct periodical survey in all the types of universities (government, private , deemed) to check the level of Job satisfaction , stress & burnout level among faculty and on the basis of that rankings shall be provided to universities to promote quality research.
- The workshops, seminars or conferences should not only be conducted by the universities for spreading a good word of mouth or for publicity purpose but to update their faculty so that they shall feel encouraged to learn new things in their particular specialization.
- It shall be mandatory for the senior faculty members to attend at least one workshop on 'how to lead and guide young faculty'/ learning different leadership styles in different situations so that the most appropriate leadership style can be adopted whenever there a need for good leader in educational Institution.
- As there exist a mandatory position/ designation of "Dean student Welfare " in all the universities for handling matters related to welfare of students of a particular university , It is recommended that apex body shall create a

mandatory new designation named 'Dean Faculty/ staff Welfare' for every 200 – 300 employees working in a university who will full time work for welfare of university employees and shall be held responsible for maintaining a minimum acceptable level of stress & a moderate level of job satisfaction among university staff/ faculty .

- A performance appraisal plan for career advancement of faculty shall be designed by HR department so that that all academicians gets a fair opportunity for growth on certain parameters like classroom teaching, research done by faculty and its contribution to society, no of subjects taught in a year, teacher student ratio, Critical Incidents handled by the faculty, extra responsibilities handled other than teaching, etc.
- There shall be fixed Job specification & Job description for teaching as well as non- teaching job which must be provided to an employee at the time of joining of job in university. This will reduce role stress prevailing among employees which become burnout in future . Policies regarding career advancement must be communicated to all teaching/ Non- Teaching staff time to time through circular/memos and also announced in meetings to ensure that all employees are well informed in advance about what kind of performance is expected from them.
- The faculty shall be allocated teaching courses as per specialization & according to their skills and preference so that no faculty leave the university/ institution for the reason of being allocated a course in which they were not comfortable.

CONCLUSIONS

It was concluded that a significant difference is found in Job Burnout levels of faculty teaching in public & private universities of Punjab on the basis of designation, experience, qualification whereas on the basis of gender there was no significant difference was found in Job Burnout & its three dimensions of faculty teaching in both public & private universities.

REFRENCES

1. *Cakınberk, A. (2011). Studying the relationship between employees' occupational burnout levels and satisfaction of life: A research in private banks. African Journal of Business Management, 5(16), 6825-6838.*
2. *Cordes, C. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (1993). A review and an integration of research on job burnout. Academy of management review, 18(4), 621-656.*
3. *Reddy, G. L., & Poornima, R. (2012). Occupational stress and professional burnout of University teachers in South India. International Journal of Educational Planning & Administration, 2(2), 109-124.*
4. *Gorji, M., & Vaziri, S. (2011). The survey job burnout status and its relation with the performance of the employees (Case study: Bank). International Conference on Innovation, Management and Service. 14,. 219- 224. Singapore: IACSIT Press*
5. *Günes, I., Bayraktar, S., & Kutaniş, R. Ö. (2009). The Relationship between Employee Levels of Organizational Commitment and Burnout for Employees: A State University Case", Suleyman Demirel University. J. Fac. Econ. Adm. Sci, 14(3), 481-497.*
6. *Kabuoh, M.N., & Anazodo, I.B. (2012). Burnout syndrome among bank workers (Case of First Bank PLC and Access Bank PLC Isolo Lagos Nigeria), Babcock Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 10(1), 289-310.*

7. *Kaur, T. (2015). Does Organization Culture Differ in Universities of Punjab?–A Comparative Study of Public and Private Universities. Innovative Journal of Business and Management, 4(2), 31-34.*

8. *Lackritz, J. R. (2004). Exploring Burnout among University Faculty: Incidence, Performance and Demographic Issues. Teach. Teacher Educ., 20, pp. 713-729.*

9. *Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E., & Leiter, M. P. 1996,MBI: The Maslach Burnout Inventory, Manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press*

10. *Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. 2001, Job burnout", Annual Review of Psychology, 52(1), pp. 397,403.*

11. *McDermott, D. (1984). Professional burnout and its relation to job characteristics, satisfaction, and control. Journal of Human Stress, 10, 79-85.*

12. *Sinha V. (2010). Job Burnout, Individual Coping Styles and Well-Being at Work: A Comparative Study of Men and Women Employees of a Private Enterprise.Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management, 3(4).*

13. *Wofford, T. D. (2003). A study of worker demographics and workplace job satisfaction for employees in a global engineering and construction organization (Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University).*